

Dear Parents and Community Members:

We are pleased to present you with the Annual Education Report (AER) which provides key information on the 2009 – 2010 educational progress for Plumbrook Elementary School. The AER demonstrates our progress toward implementing our district's vision of student achievement and meets all of the federal and state reporting guidelines for Michigan schools. The school's report contains information about student assessment, Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and teacher quality. If you have any questions about the AER, please contact the school principal for assistance.

The AER is available for you to review electronically by visiting the following web site http://www.uticak12.org/schools/sc_plumbrook.asp or you may review a copy at your child's school.

For 2009 – 2010, Plumbrook Elementary School made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in English language arts and mathematics. Our school enjoyed a very successful year and we greatly appreciate the support from our school community. The reports below demonstrate our commitment to student achievement and the continuous improvement in our planning efforts.

School Improvement Plan

The 2009-2010 school year was filled with much success for the students and staff of Plumbrook Elementary.

Writing

Plumbrook staff continued to use the 6+1 Writing Traits model, Writer's Workshop and Literacy Workstations as their main source of writing instruction. Several staff members worked together in a Writing Committee to create a timeline for writing instruction based on the 6+1 Traits and a detailed Writing Plan designed to meet the needs of Plumbrook students. In addition, the Writing Committee created Trait Resources that consisted of mini-lessons, picture books, trade books and other resources that helped teach the individual Writing Traits at each grade level.

Emphasis this year has been placed on developing more collaborative scoring of student writing together as a staff. The UCS Title I Literacy Coach shared ways to standardize accurate scoring for writing pieces. Grade level teachers collaboratively scored district writing benchmarks and data cycle pieces.

Additionally, the staff developed a writing plan for the year. Each quarter focused on one of the four writing traits identified on the current MEAP writing rubric (idea, organization, style and ideas). Writing genres included narrative writing, informational writing and peer response.

Students identified as needing additional support were provided with extra help from the classroom teacher, literacy consultant and our Response to Intervention (RtI) program. Our literacy coach and learning center teachers were very involved in helping students improve their writing through the RtI program and worked closely with classroom teachers to provide writing skill instruction for each class based on MEAP and UCS Benchmark assessment results.

Mathematics

After reviewing MEAP data from the previous two school years, staff at Plumbrook identified Geometry and Measurement as focus areas for improvement in mathematics. Each grade level created pre- and post-tests in these areas to assess student achievement throughout the school year. Our goals were to increase in student proficiency in grades three through six on the MEAP mathematics assessment; and for students in all grades to perform at grade level as measured by UCS end-of-the-year mathematics assessments.

Students identified as needing additional support in the area of mathematics participated in our Response to Intervention (RtI) program. On going data team cycles also helped determine individual student needs to form our RtI groups. RtI included working with our Intervention Paraprofessional on a bi-weekly basis using the computer based Number Worlds program. Based on our math needs at Plumbrook, the staff decided to use our Instructional Support Model (ISM) teacher for additional math support again this year. Teachers worked closely with our ISM teacher to determine areas of need for each class.

Reading

Reading was added as a third goal for Plumbrook in the 2009-2010 school year. While our MEAP Reading scores have been over 80% the last two years for all grades, there is always room for improvement. Science, social studies and even mathematics rely upon students' abilities to decode and understand text. As a result, Plumbrook's reading goal states that students will show an increase in reading comprehension according to grade level comprehension assessments.

While the goal of reading is comprehension, fluency is one of the highest corollary factors in determining reading achievement. As fluency is often dependent on decoding ability, the Plumbrook Core Data Team developed, and is continuing to develop, RtI Tier II and Tier III interventions in the area of reading. These research-based interventions are directed towards student needs in reading comprehension, fluency, and/or decoding, as determined by student results on the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), Rigby running records, Qualitative Reading Inventory, Michigan Literacy Progress Profile (MLPP), benchmark testing and/or Houghton-Mifflin Theme tests. Response to Intervention initiatives were administered by the classroom teachers, the Title I Literacy Consultant, the Title I Paraprofessionals and/or the Resource Room Teachers.

Student Enrollment

Students attend Plumbrook Elementary School based on the attendance areas serviced by our school community. A number of Utica students in other attendance areas enroll in our school based on the district's open enrollment process and nonresident students may attend through the Schools of Choice program.

Specialized Programs

Utica Center for Math Science and Technology

The Utica Center for Mathematics, Science and Technology is designed to bring advanced students with special talents and interests together with leading-edge technology. The Center utilizes an advanced curriculum for grades 9-12 which serves to inspire, challenge, and prepare students to

pursue careers in mathematics and science. The Center follows the Utica tradition of providing the finest instruction and innovation. Students are selected based on their academic record and performance on tests of aptitude and achievement.

Utica Academy for International Studies

This is a four-year high school academy designed to prepare students for completion of the International Baccalaureate (IB) Diploma Program. All students are expected to take part in artistic activities (*creativity*); sports or physical activity (*action*); and community or social service projects (*service*). This unique curriculum and the personal growth it requires of its students will provide them a mobility and adaptability that prepare students to successfully lead in the global workforce of the 21st century.

Utica Center for Science and Industry

The Center for Science and Industry is a half day shared time program that provides 9th through 12th grade students with a variety of cutting-edge Career and Technology Education taught in an integrated manner. Along with core math and English classes, students select from electives which will support one of three career strands: 1) Engineering and Technology, 2) Mechatronics, or 3) Multi-Media Technology. The CSI is project based and provides students with a wide array of experiences with professionals from business and industrial partners.

Project CLIME (Critical Language Initiative in Mandarin Education)

Project CLIME is focused on developing a strategic initiative to promote a K-12 foreign language program within Utica Community Schools. The goal will be accomplished by establishing a grades K-6 partial immersion Mandarin program at Oakbrook Elementary School feeding into a 7-12 secondary target language program housed at Heritage Junior High School, Stevenson High School and the Utica Academy for International Studies.

Core Curriculum

All the schools in Utica Community Schools offer students a comprehensive and rigorous academic program that meets and exceeds all state and federal standards. Our schools follow the Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCE) and the Michigan High School Content Expectations (HSCE). These standards can be accessed on <http://www.macomb.k12.mi.us/utica/info/>. The district's vision document entitled Indicators of Excellence can be accessed at: <http://www.uticak12.org> under the district information tab, the annual reports link.

District Assessments

Utica Community Schools not only looks at state assessments but we go above and beyond in monitoring the progress of our students. The following assessments are also given at each of the different levels to follow each student's academic progress.

Michigan Literacy Progress Profile (MLPP) is given in grades K-6 to assess students' progress in reading comprehension, phonics and fluency.

Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) is used in grades K-6 to monitor a student's reading growth on a more frequent basis. These assessments are quick snapshots of a child's improvement in literacy.

EXPLORE is a preliminary ACT assessment given to all ninth grade students in Utica Community Schools to help students prepare for high school coursework, higher education and ACT success.. It assesses students' skills in English, reading, mathematics and science.

Preliminary SAT/National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test (PSAT/NMSQT)

The PSAT/NMSQT is a standardized test given to all 10th graders in Utica Community Schools. It measures a student's skills in the areas of critical reading, math problem-solving and writing skills. It also gives the student a chance as an 11th grader to take the test and possibly qualify for the National Merit Scholarship program.

Parent/Teacher Conference Attendance

Percentage 93%

We are pleased to provide this annual education report to our school community. The information contained in this report demonstrates our continued efforts to ensure every student achieves in our school. This report, however, only tells a small part of our success story. Every day our staff is continually finding new ways to enhance teaching and learning and engage our students in their education. We invite you to continue to be active participants in your child's education by volunteering in the classrooms, serving on our parent groups, and working closely at home with your students on their assignments.

Plumbrook Elementary School is fortunate to be serviced by a community that cares so deeply about education. Thank you again for your continued support of our students and the Utica Community Schools.

Sincerely,

Sue Balcueva
Principal

Full Annual Education Report

School-Level Student Assessment Data for Macomb ISD, Utica Community Schools, Plumbrook Elementary School

Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
English Language Arts / Reading									
Grade: 03									
All Students	2008-09	100%	86.4%	91.8%	88.6%	34.1%	54.5%	9.1%	2.3%
All Students	2009-10	100%	89.8%	94.6%	87.8%	32.7%	55.1%	10.2%	2%
Female	2008-09	100%	88.3%	94.1%	92.9%	42.9%	50%	0%	7.1%
Female	2009-10	100%	91.9%	95.4%	90.5%	42.9%	47.6%	4.8%	4.8%
Male	2008-09	100%	84.6%	89.7%	86.7%	30%	56.7%	13.3%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	87.9%	93.9%	85.7%	25%	60.7%	14.3%	0%
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	75.1%	85.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	80.6%	88%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	95.1%	95.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	90%	92.4%	95%	35%	60%	5%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	92.7%	95%	86%	32.6%	53.5%	11.6%	2.3%
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	88.7%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	74.9%	76.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	82.2%	80.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	63.4%	74.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	71%	88.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	79.1%	83.2%	88.9%	44.4%	44.4%	11.1%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	84.5%	89.4%	83.3%	16.7%	66.7%	16.7%	0%

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Grade: 04									
All Students	2008-09	100%	82.8%	89.1%	82%	18%	64%	16%	2%
All Students	2009-10	100%	84.1%	91.4%	86.7%	20%	66.7%	13.3%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	84.7%	89.8%	76.2%	4.8%	71.4%	23.8%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	86.1%	92.5%	87.5%	25%	62.5%	12.5%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	80.9%	88.4%	86.2%	27.6%	58.6%	10.3%	3.4%
Male	2009-10	100%	82.1%	90.4%	86.2%	17.2%	69%	13.8%	0%
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	65.6%	79.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	68.6%	75%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	90.5%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	72.6%	90.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	88%	89.6%	82.6%	19.6%	63%	15.2%	2.2%
White	2009-10	100%	88.9%	92.5%	86%	20.9%	65.1%	14%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	61.2%	64.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited	2009-10	<10	64.3%	63.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
English Proficient									
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	54.7%	68.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	58%	77.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	72.9%	79.8%	64.7%	5.9%	58.8%	35.3%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	75.7%	84.7%	76.2%	9.5%	66.7%	23.8%	0%
Grade: 05									
All Students	2008-09	100%	81.5%	88.3%	100%	44.7%	55.3%	0%	0%
All Students	2009-10	100%	85.2%	92.9%	91.8%	42.9%	49%	8.2%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	83.4%	90.6%	100%	50%	50%	0%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	86.8%	94.3%	94.7%	47.4%	47.4%	5.3%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	79.8%	85.9%	100%	40%	60%	0%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	83.5%	91.6%	90%	40%	50%	10%	0%
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	70.4%	77.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific	2008-09	<10	90.8%	94.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Islander									
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	74.6%	87.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	86.9%	88.6%	100%	44.4%	55.6%	0%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	89.8%	93.7%	93.5%	45.7%	47.8%	6.5%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	61.8%	69.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	49.2%	61%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	57.6%	83.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	70.5%	78.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	76.6%	86.5%	77.8%	16.7%	61.1%	22.2%	0%
Grade: 06									
All Students	2008-09	100%	80.5%	89.3%	85.7%	39.3%	46.4%	12.5%	1.8%
All Students	2009-10	100%	87.7%	95.1%	95.1%	43.9%	51.2%	2.4%	2.4%
Female	2008-09	100%	82.9%	90.2%	91.3%	43.5%	47.8%	4.3%	4.3%
Female	2009-10	100%	90%	97.2%	100%	47.4%	52.6%	0%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	78.2%	88.5%	81.8%	36.4%	45.5%	18.2%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	85.4%	93%	90.9%	40.9%	50%	4.5%	4.5%

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	63.5%	82.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	75.8%	93.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	93.8%	98.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	85.7%	89.9%	85.2%	38.9%	46.3%	13%	1.9%
White	2009-10	100%	91.1%	95.1%	94.7%	44.7%	50%	2.6%	2.6%
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	79.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	51.2%	53.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	70%	82.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	44.7%	60.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	59.9%	82.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	69.2%	79.4%	80%	26.7%	53.3%	20%	0%

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	81.1%	92.6%	93.8%	43.8%	50%	0%	6.3%
Mathematics									
Grade: 03									
All Students	2008-09	100%	91.3%	94.9%	93.3%	55.6%	37.8%	6.7%	0%
All Students	2009-10	100%	94.8%	97.3%	97.9%	59.6%	38.3%	2.1%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	90.9%	94.4%	92.9%	50%	42.9%	7.1%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	94.8%	96.6%	100%	55.6%	44.4%	0%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	91.6%	95.4%	93.5%	58.1%	35.5%	6.5%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	94.8%	97.8%	96.6%	62.1%	34.5%	3.4%	0%
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	78.9%	85.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	87.7%	93.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	98%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	94.9%	95.6%	100%	58.5%	41.5%	0%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	96.9%	97.5%	97.6%	61%	36.6%	2.4%	0%
Multiracial	2009-10	<10	94.3%	95.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	85.1%	80.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	92.1%	88.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	79.7%	84.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	87.8%	96%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	85.7%	89.1%	94.4%	61.1%	33.3%	5.6%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	91.9%	93.3%	94.4%	50%	44.4%	5.6%	0%
Grade: 04									
All Students	2008-09	100%	87.9%	93.1%	86.5%	36.5%	50%	11.5%	1.9%
All Students	2009-10	100%	92.3%	96.2%	91.5%	29.8%	61.7%	8.5%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	87.9%	92.3%	100%	28.6%	71.4%	0%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	92.9%	96.5%	88.2%	35.3%	52.9%	11.8%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	87.8%	93.8%	77.4%	41.9%	35.5%	19.4%	3.2%
Male	2009-10	100%	91.6%	96%	93.3%	26.7%	66.7%	6.7%	0%
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	73.8%	85.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	82.3%	78.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	96.9%	98.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2008-09	<10	81%	84.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	92%	93.7%	85.4%	39.6%	45.8%	12.5%	2.1%
White	2009-10	100%	95.1%	97.2%	95.5%	31.8%	63.6%	4.5%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	75.7%	77%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	86.6%	78.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	100%	68.1%	80.7%	72.7%	18.2%	54.5%	27.3%	0%
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	80%	91.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	80.4%	85.4%	77.8%	11.1%	66.7%	22.2%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	87.8%	92%	86.4%	22.7%	63.6%	13.6%	0%

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Grade: 05									
All Students	2008-09	100%	76.8%	83.9%	92.5%	60%	32.5%	7.5%	0%
All Students	2009-10	100%	79.5%	87.3%	81.1%	26.4%	54.7%	18.9%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	75.8%	84%	85%	60%	25%	15%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	79.6%	87.2%	81%	23.8%	57.1%	19%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	77.8%	83.8%	100%	60%	40%	0%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	79.4%	87.3%	81.3%	28.1%	53.1%	18.8%	0%
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	62.5%	79.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	92.3%	86.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	71%	90.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	83%	85.1%	92.1%	57.9%	34.2%	7.9%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	84.3%	87.6%	80%	28%	52%	20%	0%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	67.6%	61.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	46.9%	52.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students	2009-10	<10	52.8%	71.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
with Disabilities									
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	64.4%	72.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	69.8%	79.5%	70%	5%	65%	30%	0%
Grade: 06									
All Students	2008-09	100%	79.9%	88.2%	76.8%	50%	26.8%	23.2%	0%
All Students	2009-10	100%	82%	90.5%	93%	67.4%	25.6%	7%	0%
Female	2008-09	100%	80.9%	87.3%	78.3%	43.5%	34.8%	21.7%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	83%	91.4%	89.5%	73.7%	15.8%	10.5%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	78.9%	89%	75.8%	54.5%	21.2%	24.2%	0%
Male	2009-10	100%	81.1%	89.6%	95.8%	62.5%	33.3%	4.2%	0%
Black or African American	2008-09	<10	61.2%	75.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	62.3%	73.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2009-10	<10	93.8%	88.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	85.2%	88.9%	77.8%	51.9%	25.9%	22.2%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	87.5%	91.5%	92.5%	65%	27.5%	7.5%	0%

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Multiracial	2008-09	<10	79.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2008-09	<10	62.3%	58%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	68.7%	62.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	45.5%	58.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	52.3%	76.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	100%	69%	79.8%	73.3%	26.7%	46.7%	26.7%	0%
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	72.5%	82.8%	87.5%	75%	12.5%	12.5%	0%
Science									
Grade: 05									
All Students	2008-09	100%	83.1%	90.8%	100%	75%	25%	0%	0%
All Students	2009-10	100%	81%	85.6%	82.7%	32.7%	50%	15.4%	1.9%
Female	2008-09	100%	83.3%	91.6%	100%	70%	30%	0%	0%
Female	2009-10	100%	81.1%	84.4%	76.2%	23.8%	52.4%	23.8%	0%
Male	2008-09	100%	82.9%	90.1%	100%	80%	20%	0%	0%

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
Male	2009-10	100%	80.8%	86.7%	87.1%	38.7%	48.4%	9.7%	3.2%
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	59.6%	71.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2008-09	<10	90.9%	89.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Hispanic or Latino	2009-10	<10	68.8%	71%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	100%	89.4%	91.6%	100%	73.7%	26.3%	0%	0%
White	2009-10	100%	87.5%	86.6%	83.7%	34.7%	49%	14.3%	2%
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	56.7%	52.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2008-09	<10	63.6%	72.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Students with Disabilities	2009-10	<10	60.7%	73.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2008-09	<10	72.3%	81.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	100%	70.6%	75.5%	73.7%	15.8%	57.9%	21.1%	5.3%

Michigan Merit Examination (MME)

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Advanced (Level 1)	% Proficient (Level 2)	% Partially Proficient (Level 3)	% Not Proficient (Level 4)
No records to display.									

MI-Access

Functional Independence

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
English Language Arts								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2008-09	<10	82.8%	98.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	81%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
Male	2008-09	<10	83.2%	97.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	81.3%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	87.2%	98.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	83.3%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								
All Students	2008-09	<10	83.5%	95.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	75.2%	90.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	83.1%	97%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	75.5%	92.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	69.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	85.2%	97.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	77.8%	91.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2008-09	<10	83.1%	94.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	81%	90%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	83.4%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	83%	92.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	80.6%	91.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	84.8%	97.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	83.2%	92.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
Grade: 06								
All Students	2008-09	<10	87.9%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	90.3%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	86.6%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	89.4%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2008-09	<10	80.1%	94.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	76.4%	92.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	71.4%	87.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	81.7%	96.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	78.9%	95.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	83.4%	93.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	79.3%	96.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								
All Students	2008-09	<10	86.5%	87.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	85%	97.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	87.7%	85%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	85.9%	100%	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
White	2008-09	<10	88.2%	92%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	88.4%	96.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2008-09	<10	74.6%	93%	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	71.1%	86.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	75.9%	88.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	74.2%	90.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	78.3%	93.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	74.1%	92.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 06								
All Students	2008-09	<10	83.1%	92.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2008-09	<10	81.4%	92.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	84.1%	92%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	85.6%	90.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Science								
Grade: 05								
All Students	2008-09	<10	59.6%	67.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	58%	64.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	60.6%	69.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
Male	2009-10	<10	61.6%	63.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	65.8%	75%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	63.2%	69.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10

Supported Independence

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
English Language Arts								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2008-09	<10	83.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	81.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	83.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	82.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	80.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	84.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	80.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								
All Students	2009-10	<10	79.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
Male	2009-10	<10	79.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	79.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	72.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	74.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	70.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2008-09	<10	85.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
All Students	2009-10	<10	87.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	84.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	85.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	88.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	86.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	86.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								
All Students	2009-10	<10	90.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	91%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	89.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	85.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	86.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	85.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Science								
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	76.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	76.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	76.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Participation

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
English Language Arts								
Grade: 04								

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
All Students	2008-09	<10	58.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	61.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	59.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	62.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	62.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	62.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 04								
All Students	2008-09	<10	60.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2008-09	<10	64.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2008-09	<10	61.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	58.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	60.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	59.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Science								

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Surpassed (Level 1)	% Attained (Level 2)	% Emerging (Level 3)
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	66.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	68.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	68.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

MEAP-Access

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3
Reading								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2009-10	<10	31.3%	52.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	31.2%	54.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	29.9%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3
White	2009-10	<10	31.7%	50%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	30.4%	45.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								
All Students	2009-10	<10	50.7%	72.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	50.6%	65%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	50.8%	75%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	43.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	52.8%	69.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	49.8%	86.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	50%	71.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Female	2009-10	<10	53.8%	63%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	48%	77.8%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	52.5%	73.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	48%	74.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 06								

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3
All Students	2009-10	<10	48.3%	71.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	47.8%	77.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	52%	76.1%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Mathematics								
Grade: 03								
All Students	2009-10	<10	60.1%	70%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	62.2%	65.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	54.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	63.8%	70.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	60.8%	69%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Grade: 04								
All Students	2009-10	<10	73%	86.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	74%	85.3%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Black or African American	2009-10	<10	67.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	76.4%	88.4%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	72.5%	90.6%	<10	<10	<10	<10

Student Group	School Year	% Students Tested	State % Students Proficient	District % Students Proficient	School % Students Proficient	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3
Disadvantaged								
Grade: 05								
All Students	2009-10	<10	62.6%	73.7%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Male	2009-10	<10	63.6%	84.2%	<10	<10	<10	<10
White	2009-10	<10	65.9%	73.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10
Limited English Proficient	2009-10	<10	62.5%	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Economically Disadvantaged	2009-10	<10	60.3%	60%	<10	<10	<10	<10

2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Detail Reporting for Macomb ISD, Utica Community Schools, Plumbrook Elementary School

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
All Students		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.1%	93.9%
Mathematics	98.9%	93.7%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.9%	95.7%
Mathematics	99.7%	95.5%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.4%	92.7%
Mathematics	100.5%	95.9%
Black or African American		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	97.7%	88.4%
Mathematics	97.4%	88%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	100.3%	90.4%
Mathematics	100.3%	89.4%
School		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
American Indian or Alaska Native		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.2%	93.2%
Mathematics	99%	92.4%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.5%	96.8%
Mathematics	99.6%	97.5%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.5%	97%
Mathematics	99.8%	97%
School		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
Hispanic or Latino		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.3%	91.3%
Mathematics	98.9%	92.4%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.2%	90.5%
Mathematics	99.2%	94.8%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
White		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	99.4%	95.3%
Mathematics	99.3%	95.1%
District		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	99.9%	95.9%
Mathematics	99.7%	95.7%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	92.6%
Mathematics	100.5%	95.6%
Multiracial		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.4%	93.5%
Mathematics	102.3%	94.3%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	98.9%	94%
Mathematics	98.9%	96.4%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
Limited English Proficient		
State		

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
English Language Arts / Reading	123.6%	86.9%
Mathematics	126.3%	92.3%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	141.8%	88.4%
Mathematics	149.3%	91.2%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	<30	<30
Mathematics	<30	<30
Students with Disabilities		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	73.1%
Mathematics	102.2%	76.5%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	104.9%	77.7%
Mathematics	104.3%	79.7%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	113.2%	69.8%
Mathematics	113.2%	84.9%

Subject	% Tested (Goal 95%)	% Proficient for AYP*
Economically Disadvantaged		
State		
English Language Arts / Reading	102.6%	90.6%
Mathematics	102.5%	91.1%
District		
English Language Arts / Reading	104.1%	92.3%
Mathematics	104.8%	92.9%
School		
English Language Arts / Reading	110.3%	91.4%
Mathematics	110.3%	94.6%

Note: 467 Recently arrived LEP students took part in the State's ELPA instead of the MEAP/MME/MI-Access.

* [AYP Targets \(Annual Measurable Objectives\)](#)

Graduation Rate (High Schools only) (Goal 80%)	
All Students	
State	
75.39%	
District	

Graduation Rate (High Schools only) (Goal 80%)	
	91.82%
Black or African American	
State	
	56.59%
District	
	76.64%
American Indian or Alaska Native	
State	
	65%
District	
	<10
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	
State	
	84.47%

Graduation Rate (High Schools only)
(Goal 80%)

District

>95%

Hispanic or Latino

State

59.94%

District

87.5%

White

State

81.85%

District

92.5%

Multiracial

Graduation Rate (High Schools only)
(Goal 80%)

State

71.12%

District

<10

Limited English Proficient

State

65.51%

District

77.78%

Students with Disabilities

State

57.61%

District

75.12%

Graduation Rate (High Schools only)
(Goal 80%)

Economically Disadvantaged

State

59.8%

District

78.57%

Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)

All Students

State

94.7%

District

95.7%

School

92.3%

Black or African American

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

State

91%

District

93.9%

School

85.9%

American Indian or Alaska Native

State

93.7%

District

96%

Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander

State

96.5%

**Attendance Rate
(Goal 90%)**

District

96.4%

School

99.7%

Hispanic or Latino

State

94.1%

District

94.1%

School

67.3%

White

State

95.7%

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
District	
	95.8%
School	
	92.8%
Multiracial	
State	
	94.8%
District	
	93.6%
School	
	97.2%
Limited English Proficient	
State	
	94.6%

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
District	
	95.1%
School	
	94%
Students with Disabilities	
State	
	93.5%
District	
	94.6%
School	
	89.6%
Economically Disadvantaged	
State	
	94.8%

Attendance Rate (Goal 90%)	
District	95.8%
School	91.4%

* All data based on students enrolled for a full academic year.

** More information regarding AYP can be found at the following link:

http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_22875---,00.html

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives for Reading/ELA

School Year	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
2001-02		38%			31%		42%
2002-03		38%			31%		42%
2003-04		38%			31%		42%
2004-05		48%			43%		52%
2005-06	50%	48%	46%	45%	43%	41%	52%
2006-07	50%	48%	46%	45%	43%	41%	52%
2007-08	60%	59%	57%	56%	54%	53%	61%
2008-09	60%	59%	57%	56%	54%	53%	61%
2009-10	70%	69%	68%	67%	66%	65%	71%

School Year	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
2010-11	78%	77%	76%	75%	74%	73%	79%
2011-12	86%	85%	84%	83%	82%	82%	86%
2012-13	93%	92%	92%	91%	91%	91%	93%
2013-14	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Michigan Annual AYP Objectives for Mathematics

School Year	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
2001-02		47%				31%	33%
2002-03		47%				31%	33%
2003-04		47%				31%	33%
2004-05		56%				43%	44%
2005-06	59%	56%	53%	50%	46%	43%	44%
2006-07	59%	56%	53%	50%	46%	43%	44%
2007-08	67%	65%	62%	60%	57%	54%	55%
2008-09	67%	65%	62%	60%	57%	54%	55%
2009-10	67%	65%	62%	60%	57%	54%	55%
2010-11	75%	74%	71%	70%	67%	66%	67%
2011-12	83%	82%	81%	80%	78%	77%	78%
2012-13	91%	91%	90%	90%	89%	89%	89%
2013-14	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

2009-10 School-Level Accountability (AYP) Status Reporting for Macomb ISD, Utica Community Schools, Plumbrook

Elementary School

School AYP Status

Title 1 Status	AYP ELA/Reading Status	AYP Mathematics Status	AYP Overall Status	Education Yes Report Card Grade	School Improvement Status	Years in Improvement
Yes	Met	Met	Met	A	N/A	0

December, 2009 School-Level Teacher Quality Reporting for Macomb ISD, Utica Community Schools, Plumbrook Elementary School

	Other	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D
Professional Qualifications of All Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School	0	8	29	1

Professional Qualifications are defined by the State and may include information such as the degrees of public school teachers (e.g., percentage of teachers with Bachelors Degrees or Masters Degrees) or the percentage of fully certified teachers

Percentage of Public Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the School with Emergency Certification	0%
--	----

	School Aggregate
Percentage of Core Academic Subject Elementary and Secondary School Classes not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	0%

Michigan Report Card for the National Assessment of Educational Progress

NAEP 2009 Grade 4 Mathematics Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	22	43	30	5
Male	50	22	41	30	7
Female	50	22	45	29	4
National Lunch Program Eligibility					
Eligible	43	36	47	16	1
Not Eligible	56	11	40	40	9
Info not available	†	†	†	†	†
Race Ethnicity					
White	71	14	43	37	6
Black	20	52	39	9	0
Hispanic	5	29	51	19	1
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	3	13	32	36	19
American Indian	1	†	†	†	†
Unclassified	1	†	†	†	†
Student classified as having a disability	12	42	39	17	2
SD	88	19	44	31	6

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
Not SD					
Student is an English Language Learner	3	48	40	11	1
ELL	97	21	43	31	5
Not ELL					

‡ Reporting Standards not met. Note: Observed differences are not necessarily statistically significant. Detail may not sum to total because of rounding. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education. Institute for Education Sciences. National Center for Education Statistics. National Assessment Program (NAEP) 2009 Mathematics Achievement.

NAEP 2009 Grade 8 Mathematics Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	32	37	24	7
Male	51	31	37	24	8
Female	49	33	38	24	5
National Lunch Program Eligibility					
Eligible	38	50	37	12	1
Not Eligible	62	21	38	31	10
Info not available	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Race Ethnicity					
White	74	23	40	29	8
Black	18	68	27	4	1
Hispanic	4	38	45	15	2
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	2	11	30	31	28
American Indian	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Unclassified	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student classified as having a disability	10	75	22	2	1
SD	90	27	39	27	7

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
Not SD					
Student is an English Language Learner	2	58	32	10	0
ELL	98	32	37	24	7
Not ELL					

‡ Reporting Standards not met. NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education. Institute for Education Sciences. National Center for Education Statistics. National Assessment Program (NAEP) 2009 Mathematics Achievement.

NAEP 2009 Grade 4 Reading Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	36	34	23	6
Male	50	39	35	21	5
Female	50	32	34	26	8
National Lunch Program Eligibility					
Eligible	43	52	33	13	2
Not Eligible	57	24	36	31	10
Info not available	#	‡	‡	‡	‡
Race Ethnicity					
White	71	28	36	28	8
Black	19	65	26	7	1
Hispanic	5	49	34	15	2
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	3	21	37	25	17
American Indian	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Unclassified	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student classified as having a disability	10	66	24	8	3
SD	90	32	36	25	7

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
Not SD					
Student is an English Language Learner	3	65	26	9	1
ELL	97	35	35	24	7
Not ELL					

Rounds to zero

‡ Reporting Standards not met. NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Reading Assessment.

NAEP 2009 Grade 8 Reading Results

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
All Students	100	28	41	28	3
Male	51	33	42	23	2
Female	49	23	41	32	4
National Lunch Program Eligibility					
Eligible	37	44	41	14	1
Not Eligible	62	18	42	36	4
Info not available	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Race Ethnicity					
White	74	21	32	32	3
Black	18	54	37	9	#
Hispanic	4	40	34	24	2
Asian Amer/Pacif Isl	2	‡	‡	‡	‡
American Indian	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Unclassified	1	‡	‡	‡	‡
Student classified as having a disability	9	73	22	4	#

Reporting Group	Percent of Students	Percent below Basic	Percent Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
SD Not SD	91	23	43	30	3
Student is an English Language Learner	2	60	33	8	#
ELL Not ELL	98	27	42	28	3

Rounds to zero

‡ Reporting Standards not met. NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Reading Assessment.

Grade	Subject	Participation Rate for Students with Disabilities	Standard Error	Participation Rate for IEP Students	Standard Error	Participation Rate for Limited English Proficient Students	Standard Error
4	Math	82.08	2.771	81.98	2.786	91.89	3.063
	Reading	72.05	2.592	72.01	2.63	81.16	3.53
8	Math	76.39	2.561	76.21	2.578	93.13	4.12
	Reading	70.72	3.239	70.46	3.298	85.15	4.505